

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3 are amended. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found at least at page 8, lines 25-31 and page 10, lines 9-11, for example. Claims 2-3 are amended for clarity and to address informalities. No new matter is added. In view of at least the following, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

**I. Claim Objections**

The Office Action objects to claim 1 for informalities. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to replace "the fragmentation-transmission key" with "the symmetrical fragmentation-transmission secret key." Further, claim 3 is similarly amended.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, the Office Action asserts that "the sending element downloads a database listing the authorized sending elements, a symmetrical fragmentation-transmission secret key" is unclear.

By this Amendment, to clarify the presently claimed subject matter, claim 1 is amended to recite "the sending element downloads a symmetrical fragmentation-transmission secret key from a database listing the authorized sending elements."

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0003881 (Reitmeier). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that Reitmeier fails to teach at least that "a size and content of the symmetrical fragmentation-transmission secret key is dependent on a size of the telecommunication or radiocommunication networks," as recited in independent claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that Reitmeier takes a file, segments the file into multiple packets, and randomly identifies these packets. Each of these packets is then associated with a transmission route. Reitmeier uses an encryption technique to "securitize" the transmission routes, and uses non-specific reassembly conventions, which may be based on classical mathematical methods. However, Reitmeier's encryption technique simply does not disclose or suggest that "a size and content of the symmetrical fragmentation-transmission secret key is dependent on a size of the telecommunication or radiocommunication networks," as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Reitmeier does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claim 1. Claims 2-8 variously depend from claim 1. Because the applied reference fails to anticipate or render obvious the features recited in independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-8 are patentable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is patentable, as well as for the additional features they recite.


Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge  
Registration No. 30,024

Linda M. Saltiel  
Registration No. 51,122

WPB:SZS/hms

Attachment:  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: May 11, 2009

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

|  |
|--|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE<br/>AUTHORIZATION<br/>Please grant any extension<br/>necessary for entry;<br/>Charge any fee due to our<br/>Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|--|